DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 885 FL 001 392

AUTHOR	Benson, Morton
TITLE	Soviet Standardization of Russian.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.
PUB DATE	61
NOTE	16p.
JOURNAL CIT	The Slavic and East European Journal; v5 p263-278 1961
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Descriptive Linguistics, Dialects, Grammar, *Language Standardization, Language Styles, Language Usage, Morphology (Languages), *National Norms, *Nonstandard Dialects, Phonetics, Phonology, Regional Dialects, *Russian, Slavic Languages, Social Dialects, Sociolinguistics, *Standard Spoken Usage

ABSTRACT

After a brief history of influences on the standardization of Russian since the Revolution, the descriptive and normalizing role of specific reference works of grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, and morphology is discussed. Concluding remarks point out a problem caused by a lack of coordination of standardization efforts and the mounting demands for its increase. (RL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038885

SOVIET STANDARDIZATION OF RUSSIAN

By Morton Benson

University of Pennsylvania

Soviet policy toward language has been a subject of keen interest to linguists and to specialists on the U.S.S.R.[1] Various works in the West have been devoted to Soviet linguistic theory and to treatment of language problems. One subject of interest has been Marrism.[2] Another major subject of Western research has been Soviet efforts to Russify minority languages with regulated introduction into these languages of Russian political and scientific terminology.[3] No study, however, has as yet treated a certain aspect of language policy often referred to in Soviet linguistic literature, namely, the movement to complete the standardization of Russian. This paper will discuss Soviet standardization of Russian: the historical background, the problems, the progress.

During the last several centuries, strong tendencies toward the development of a single standard have appeared among all the major languages of Europe. The elements stimulating linguistic centralization include, among others, the emergence of a strong central government, nationalism, increase in reading material of all types, mobility of the population, compulsory military service, spread of education and literacy, influence of mass communications media.[4] These general factors were functioning in Czarist Russia and have continued to function in Soviet Russia.[5] To be sure, in the Soviet Union the standardization of Russian has been subjected to special additional types of influence. The evolution of these should be traced briefly at this point.

FL 001 392

During the years immediately following the Revolution, various conditions arose which had a destructive impact on the standard language.[6] These conditions can be enumerated as follows: The disappearance from public life of many highly educated speakers, the appearance of dialect-speaking semi-literate persons in important public positions, the fondness of Marxist intellectuals for borrowing Western-European

From: The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 5, 1961.

words on an extravagant scale, the Communist tendency to negate the old bourgeois cultural values, the official policy of encouraging minority languages, the replacement of pre-War political concepts by Revolutionary innovations. These conditions led to linguistic chaos. Russian was inundated by an enormous influx of dialectisms, sub-standard and slang forms, vulgarisms, abbreviated words and other neologisms, foreign borrowings, and political clichés.

The new Revolutionary-style Russian was viewed with repugnance by various leading politicians, educators, and writers.[7] However, the conservative opposition remained impotent during the 1920's even though Lenin himself supported it.[8] The turning point came in the middle 1930's. Maksim Gor'kij led the return to linguistic stabilization and moderation.[9] This meant a return to the Russian of the pre-War classics, a restoration of a stable literary Russian as opposed to the proliferation of non-standard forms. The restitution of the pre-War standard coincided with the re-emergence of Great Russian nationalism. From the 1930's to the present, this exaggerated nationalism has dominated the Soviet scene.[10] It helped bring about the notorious linguistic discussion of 1950.[11] This discussion destroyed the Marrist view that Soviet-era Russian could not be considered the same language as the standard used before 1917. According to Marr, the overthrow of the base of society had caused the overthrow of the cultural superstructure, including language. Stalin himself declared emphatically at the height of the discussion that language was independent of both superstructure and base, and, therefore, was not subject to sudden change.[12] He expressed his agreement with the traditional concept that a single, national standard Russian has existed from the time of Puškin into the Soviet era.

The post-War policy of the government has been to exalt the role of Russian as the language of the leading Soviet ethnic group. Russian is glorified not only as the lingua franca of the U.S.S.R., but, in addition, as a major world language.[13]

The campaign to stress the primacy of Russian was reinforced by the creation on March 14, 1958, of a Russian Language Institute in the Academy of Sciences.[14] The announcement concerning the creation of the Institute declared that the "enhanced world significance of the Russian language

makes necessary a more profound . . . study [thereof] . . ."[15] The Institute's Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture was to concentrate on the standardization of Russian. In fact, this Section took over the work of the section for Speech Culture, organized on August 29, 1952, within the Academy's Linguistics Institute.[16] The Section for Speech Culture had been assigned the mission of organizing linguists-attempts to ascertain "what the norms of modern Russian and the other literary languages of the U.S.S.R. are and what, in general, language norm is."[17] The close tie between standardization and stylistics was recognized.[18]

After this brief historical sketch, we can turn to the Soviets' approach to the problem of defining the terms "standard Russian" and "standardization" of Russian. In regard to defining these terms Soviet linguistis have offered nothing original. V. Vinogradov, the leading Soviet specialist on modern Russian, has mentioned the problem of defining standard in his discussion of stylistics, but he does not give a specific definition.[19] Other Soviet linguists, such as Gvozdev and Ožegov, have attempted definitions. Gvozdev states that the "basic features of a linguistic standard are: unity, uniformity, the absence of fluctuation, the general acceptability of linguistic forms."[20] He adds that the use of non-standard forms can interfere seriously with the speaker's or reader's comprehension.[21] Ožegov writes that the "standard is the system of linguistic forms which are the most suitable ('correct,' 'preferable') for serving society."[22] Neither Gvozdev nor Ožegov gives any indication of how to determine which forms are most "uniform," "acceptable," "suitable," "correct," or "preferable." Soviet linguists are not content with the preceding definitions. A recent editorial in the journal Problems of Linguistics calls for a clarification of the "linguistic standard."[23] Apparently, in practice, Soviet linguists consider standard Russian to be the language used by highly educated speakers in the major Great-Russian cities.[24] Its most stable variant in the formal, written language. Spoken standard Russian differs, of course, somewhat from its written counterpart.[25]

No precise definition of "standardization" was found in the literature examined for this study. Apparently, Soviet linguists consider it to be the complete description of contemporary Russian along with the establishment of its norms. Standardization, therefore, goes further than mere description

by including the selection of preferred or permissible forms whenever variants exist.[26] The importance of stylistic considerations in dealing with variants is referred to often.[27]

Even with the previously mentioned emergence of national standards, the determination of norms for any living language is complicated by several problems. Firstly, for many languages no complete, accurate, synchronic description has been made. Secondly, it is difficult to keep pace with the changes which all living languages undergo. Thirdly, there is no generally established method for classifying as "standard," "acceptable," or "sub-standard" the variants and marginal forms which a linguistic description reveals. A fourth problem is that some languages with a literary tradition evince significant differences between the written standard and the spoken standard.[28] The remainder of this paper will deal briefly with the first two problems, namely, the achievements of Soviet linguists in describing Russian and their treatment of change. It will then go on to discuss in detail the Soviet linguists' treatment of variants.

In the last twenty-five years significant progress has been achieved in the description of modern Russian. The first volume of Ušakov's Explanatory Dictionary of Russian (Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka), published in 1935, ushered in this period. After Ušakov's four-volume Dictionary had been completed in 1940, other important contributions to Russian lexicography were made. They are the four editions of Ožegov's one-volume Dictionary of Russian (Slovar' russkogo jazyka) (Moskva, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1960); the Academy's fifteen-volume Dictionary of Current Literary Russian (Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka), of which ten volumes have been completed (Moskva, 1951—); the Academy's four-volume Dictionary of Russian (Slovar' russkogo jazyka), which has been completed this year (Moskva, 1957-1961); Ožegov and A. Šapiro, Orthographic Dictionary of Russian (Orfografičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka) (3rd ed., Moskva, 1958).

In the area of grammatical description, V. Vinogradov has played the leading role. His Russian Language (Russkij jazyk) (Moskva, 1947) has exerted strong influence on subsequent works concerning the morphology of Russian. Vinogradov has also served as the chief editor of the Academy's major two-volume Russian Grammar (Grammatika russkogo jazyka), which has appeared in two editions (Moskva, 1953-54 and 1960). The second edition is basically a reprint of the first.

The phonetic system of modern Russian has been described in various works. The most significant of these for this study are the following: L. V. Ščerba's phonetic introduction in the Academy Grammar; R. I Avanesov and I. S. Ožegov, Russian Literary Pronunciation and Stress (Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie i udarenie) (Moskva, 1954 and 1959, with a reprint of the 2nd ed. in 1960); R. I. Avanesov, Russian Literary Pronunciation (Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie) (Moskva, 1950, 1954, and 1958). The stage pronunciation has been described in the following: G. Vinokur, Russian Stage Pronunciation (Russkoe sceničeskoe proiznošenie) (Moskva, 1948); I. S. Il'inskaja and V. N. Sidorov, "Concerning the Stage Pronunciation in the Theaters of Moscow" ("O sceničeskom proiznošenii v moskovskix teatrax"), Questions of Speech Culture (Voprosy kul'tury reči) (Moskva, 1955), pp. 143-171; I. Saričeva, Stage Speech (Sceničeskaja reč') (Moskva, 1955).

The selected works just listed are major achievements in the description of standard Russian. They offer a far more complete picture of the language than was available twenty-five years ago. Ušakov's Dictionary, for example, represented a milestone in the description of the standard Russian lexicon (and morphology) even though it was below the level of existing dictionaries for the major languages of western Europe. However, Soviet works still do not describe Russian as well as could be hoped for. Although the Academy Grammar, for example, represents by far the fullest available description of the standard Russian grammar, it has serious shortcomings.[29] Other Soviet works also fail at times to present a clear description of current standard Russian. One striking example of inconsistency is afforded by the treatment of a subject as fundamental as the alphabet. Examination of recent Soviet dictionaries gives rise to the question of whether the Russian alphabet has thirty-two or thirty-three letters, i. e., whether the ë is to be considered a letter or not. Thus Ožegov's Dictionary lists ë as an independent letter and shows the alphabet as having thirty-three letters.[30] However, the Academy's four-volumes and fifteen-volume dictionaries now being compiled list i as the ninth letter, which indicates that ë was not counted and that the alphabet will total thirty-two letters in the completed dictionaries.[31]

Soviet linguists are fully aware that a language always changes and that, consequently, the standard can never be

considered static.[32] A comparison of the phonetic introduction to Ušakov's Dictionary and Ožegov's Dictionary (first three editions) shows that the shift from the old Moscow standard pronunciation to a new standard has been recognized clearly. In addition, if we compare the description of stage pronunciation in the three works cited above — Vinokur (published in 1948); Il'inskaja and Sidorov (published in 1955, based on observations made in 1951-1952); and Saričeva (published in 1955) — we see that even in this traditionally conservative area, the change to the new norm has been recognized. Thus, for the unstressed, third-person plural ending of second conjugation verbs, Vinokur still gave phonetically [ut] (p. 55). Il'inskaja and Sidorov described both [ut] and [ət] as acceptable (pp. 150-151). Saričeva confirmed the new norm by giving only [ət] (p. 91). Saričeva also reflected the new standard for other aspects of Russian pronunciation. Vinokur (p. 62) and Il'inskaja and Sidorov (p. 149) indicated the hard pronunciation of the velar before i in such words as gromkij 'loud,' vytaskivat' 'to drag out.' Saričeva gave, however, the soft pronunciation (p. 91). As for the final s in reflexive verbs, both Vinokur (p. 65) and Il'inskaja and Sidorov (pp. 147-148) retained the hard variant as the standard, although the latter do note the sporadic use of the soft pronunciation. Saričeva, on the other hand, described the soft form as standard (p. 90).

It is more difficult to describe those changes taking place in morphology and syntax than those in the phonetic structure. It is, therefore, not surprising that Soviet attempts to record new grammatical norms have been less systematic than their efforts to keep pace with current pronunciation.[33] The most difficult changes to record are, of course, those in the lexicon. Ožegov, the leading Soviet lexicographer, has deplored the fact that Soviet dictionaries simply cannot keep abreast of contemporary lexical innovations.[34]

Let us now turn to a detailed examination of how Soviet works have dealt with the major problem in standardization — the treatment of variants. First, it must be noted that the basic conflict between pure description on one hand, and standardization, i.e., selection of variants, on the other, is noticeable in Soviet works. The conflict existed, of course, before the Revolution. The noted linguist, A.A. Šaxmatov, in particular, did not consider the selection of preferable variants to fall within the competence of the linguist.[35]

L. V. Ščerba, while recognizing the need of normative grammars, warned as follows: "excessive standardization is harmful: it emasculates the language, depriving it of flexibility. One should never forget the negative example set by the French Academy."[36] Doubts concerning normalization have been expressed by others very recently. For example, the following statement by Avanesov, a leading figure in Soviet standardization efforts, appears in the Foreword of the 1954 and 1958 editions of his Russian Literary Pronunciation: "no one author . . . is able or has the right to take upon himself the functions of a 'legislator,' prescribing pronunciation norms."[37]

However, in spite of such statements, the basic trend in recent Soviet works is normative. Thus, Avanesov, immediately after making the statement just cited, added that further research should produce "the possibility of strengthening the normative element in following editions of the book."[38] The same Avanesov, together with Ožegov, wrote as follows in the Foreword to Russian Literary Pronunciation and Stress: "the editorial staff has striven to achieve the strictest possible normalization of pronunciation and stress."[39] Other works, such as the Academy Grammar, Ožegov's Dictionary and the Academy four-volume and fifteen-volume dictionaries, also indicate in their Introductions that they aim to be normative rather than solely descriptive. Ožegov, as director of the Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture of the Russian Language Institute, occupies a key position in present standardization attempts. He writes that the Soviet linguist "not only records and explains linguistic facts, . . . but . . . acts as a legislator of the norms."[40] Another indication of the current interest in standardization is a recent article in the journal Questions of Linguistics by O. S. Axmanova et al.[41] The authors point to the necessity of working out a scientific classification for syntactical, lexicological, and stylistic variants.[42] The article proposes the introduction of a new sub-branch of grammar to be called ortologija 'orthology,' which would systematically classify variants and thereby aid standardization efforts.[43]

If we look at current Soviet normative works as a whole, the following general picture emerges. The works prepared outside the Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture are not co-ordinated in regard to standardization. This statement applies to the Academy dictionaries, the

Academy Grammar,[44] and also to the early editions of Ožegov and Avanesov. The lack of consistent normalization in these works has aroused strong censure from the Soviet linguists who have reviewed them. The reviewers have unanimously condemned the failure to progress toward complete standardization. The following two comments taken from reviews and discussions illustrate this condemnation. The first is from a review of the Academy four-volume Dictionary: "We have observed that the feeling of perplexity among language teachers and students of philology reaches a climax when they notice that the Academy Grammar rejects what the [Academy four-volume] Dictionary accepts."[45] The second is from a review of the Academy Grammar: "However, at times the reader comes across sections which only record a fact without expressing the author's evaluation thereof . . . Unfortunately . . . the compiler seems to forget that a grammar serves first of all as a normativestylistic reference work."[46] Other reviews and discussions contain similar statements.[47]

On the other hand, the recent works prepared by personnel of the Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture, i.e., Ožegov's Dictionary (1960)[48] and Avanesov and Ožegov's Russian Literary Pronunciation and Stress (1959), represent the beginning of an effort to attain the final standardization of Russian. (These two works will be referred to hereafter as Ožegov and Avanesov, respectively.) A major specific objective of this study is to demonstrate precisely how Ožegov and Avanesov have more consistently proceeded toward normalization than the other works cited. We turn now to this analysis. (For the sake of simplification, the incomplete fifteen-volume Dictionary will not be included in the following discussion.) Page references will be made in parentheses to Volume I of the Academy Grammar (2nd ed.) and also to Avanesov when the page referred to is not in its alphabetized section.

First, questions of pronunciation and stress will be examined. The Academy Grammar admits as free variants the hard and soft (by assimilatory softening) forms of s in the words smelyj 'bold,' svist 'whistle,' pospet' 'to ripen' and of z in zvenet' 'to ring' (p. 76). Avanesov admits only the soft variant. The Grammar describes as possible the softening of m in bombit' 'to bomb' (p. 77). Avanesov indicates as standard only the hard variant. The Grammar describes as equal variants the hard or soft z in izbit' 'to beat thoroughly'

(p. 76). Avanesov lists the soft z in this word as only acceptable. The Grammar considers as equally good both pronunciations of šč, i.e., the long soft sibilant [š'š'] or the combination of soft sibilant plus soft affricate [š'č'] (p. 49). Avanesov describes the latter pronunciation as only acceptable (p. 682). The Grammar indicates that in slow, careful pronunciation the t may be heard in the roots of such words as antifašistskij 'anti-Fascist' and al'pinistskij 'mountain-climbing' (pp 80-81). Avanesov allows no such pronunciation. The Grammar states that the plural of kogot' 'claw' may have a fricative before the t: [kóxt'i] (p. 79). Avanesov admits only the explosive k in this form: [kókt'i].

We turn now to variations in stress. The Grammar presents as free variants the past tense reflexive forms drálsja and dralsjá 'he fought,' vílsja and vilsjá 'he twisted,' sobrálsja and sobralsjá 'he got ready' (p. 481). Avanesov describes only the root-stressed forms as standard, the end-stressed variants being marked as obsolete. The four-volume Academy Dictionary gives both vkrápit' and vkrapít' 'to intersperse' as standard. Ožegov gives only vkrápit'. The four-volume Dictionary lists the variants apartáment and apartamént 'large apartment.' Ožegov gives only apartáment.

As for short adjective forms, the Grammar gives as free variants the singular neuters málo and maló 'small,' p'jáno and p'janó 'drunk,' stáro and staró 'old' and the plurals mály and malý 'small,' vrédny and vredný 'harmful,' gódny and godný 'fit,' míly and milý 'nice,' nóvy and nový 'new' (pp. 323-324). Avanesov is once again stricter, either allowing only one variant, or selecting one variant as preferable. Thus, it lists only maló, p'jáno, malý, p'jány and describes the variants stáro, vrédny, gódny, míly, nóvy as preferable to staró, vredný, godný, milý, and nový.

In closing this discussion of phonetic variants, it should be noted that at present the Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture is circulating a pronunciation questionnaire.[49] This questionnaire is designed to shed light on unsettled areas of contemporary Russian pronunciation. For instance, it deals with the questions of assimilatory softening, the pronunciation of šč, the change of a velar explosive before another consonant to a velar fricative — all of which have already been mentioned. Also, the questionnaire is concerned with the pronunciation in recent loanwords of unstressed o, consonants before e, and double consonants.

In addition, it includes questions about the pronunciation of čn in various words, the pronunciation of certain vowels in various unstressed positions, the pronunciation of consonants before the hard sign, the pronunciation of g in various words, the pronunciation of the s in reflexive verb endings.

We now turn to morphological variants. Here the four-volume Dictionary will be compared with the Ožegov Dictionary. The four-volume Dictionary often gives as free variants of one verb two imperfective forms — one ending in -ivat' or -yvat', the other in -at' or -jat'. Ožegov, on the other hand, often gives only one form. This practice in Ožegov's Dictionary is not primarily due to its smaller size but rather to its stronger tendency toward standardization. Thus, the four-volume Dictionary gives the following as free variants: izgotavlivat' — izgotovljat' 'to manufacture,' nakaplivat' — nakopljat' 'to accumulate,' vyskal'zyvat' — vyskol'zat' 'to slip out,' obrezyvat' — obrezat' 'to cut off,' odarivat' — odarjat' 'to endow,' etc. Ožegov, by contrast, lists only izgotovljat', nakaplivat', vyskal'zyvat', obrezat', and odarivat'.

In other miscellaneous examples we see the same contrast. The four-volume Dictionary gives as variants bivak — bivuak 'bivouac,' klaviša — klaviš 'key' (on typewriter, piano), legalizovat' — legalizirovat' 'to legalize,' etc. Ožegov lists only bivak, klaviša, and legalizovat'.

The co-ordination between the latest editions of Ožegov and Avanesov is demonstrated by their treatment of masculine nouns vacillating in the nominative plural between the regular -y or -i endings and stressed -a or -ja. A study has shown that in regard to such nouns the 1952 edition of Ožegov differed from the 1955 edition of Avanesov in forty-one instances.[50] However, if we compare the 1960 edition of Ožegov with the 1959 Avanesov, we find that the number of disagreements has shrunk to seven. Essentially, Ožegov has shifted to conform with Avanesov and has adjusted his description of all doubtful nouns except one in the 1960 edition. Avanesov, on the other hand, carried over almost intact his description of fluctuating nouns from the 1955 to the 1959 edition.[51]

This approach to uniformity in normative works by no means signifies uniformity in actual usage. For example, both Ožegov and Avanesov give as the plural of sous 'sauce,' 'gravy,' 'dressing' the form sósy. Avanesov even warns specifically that sousá is incorrect. However, in a recent Soviet handbook on cooking we find first sousá, but on the

facing page sóusy.[52] This example is especially demonstrative. The two variants are printed almost side by side in a Soviet technical work, where linguistic fluctuations rarely take place. The occurrence of the two forms in a technical style bears witness to the vitality of y — á fluctuation in modern Russian.[53]

It appears evident that Soviet standardization efforts will not stop the production of perfectly co-ordinated grammars and dictionaries. Soviet linguists have in mind that the established standard be acquired by speakers not only among the highly educated, but also among the huge mass of the population.[54] Teachers of Russian have the difficult mission of raising the language habits of the masses to the level of standard Russian by eliminating sub-standard and dialectal traits from the speech of their students.[55]

The following concluding remarks can be made. In the last twenty-five years, significant normative-descriptive works on Russian have been published within the Soviet Union. Attempts to complete the standardization of Russian have, however, begun to take concrete form only recently, with the works emanating from the three-year old Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture of the Academy's Russian Language Institute. Other works published by the Russian Language Institute are not consistently normative. This fact would indicate that overall co-ordination of standardization attempts is yet to be achieved. The reviews of Soviet works on Russian express dissatisfaction with this confusion. They seem to reflect a stong sentiment at the "grass-roots" level to see the doubtful features of contemporary Russian cleared up by the recognized scholarly authority, i.e., the Academy of Sciences. Probably, much of the pressure for completing the standardization of Russian can be attributed to the enormous growth of Russian language instruction both within the Soviet Union and abroad. The schoolteacher obviously tends to rely on the "standard" and becomes frustrated when authoritative reference works disagree.[56]

Two conclusions of this paper — namely that standardization efforts are still not co-ordinated fully and that there are popular demands for standardization — were confirmed after this study had been completed when the late Professor K. I. Bylinskij's book Stress Dictionary for Radio and Television Workers (Slovar' udarenij dlja rabotnikov radio i televidenija) (Moskva, 1960) arrived in this country (in February, 1961). The aforementioned lack of co-ordination is indicated by the

fact that the Foreword to this book conspicuously avoids any reference to the work of Avanesov or of the Section for Contemporary Literary Language and Speech Culture. Concerning the source material for this stress dictionary, the Foreword refers only to the data gathered in the files of the Government Radio and Television Committee and to a file of "difficult" words submitted by radio announcers (pp. 4-5). As to the prevalent desire for standardization of pronunciation, the Foreword states:

> Often . . . the data found in various reference works and even in the various editions of the very same reference work contradict each other. At the same time, announcers . . . are obligated to use one standard pronunciation and stress. Inconsistency in radio and television pronunciation, the slightest deviation from the established phonetic standard arouse protests and at times even strong indignation on the part of listeners and viewers. (Pp. 3-4.)

Future attempts to reduce the number of variants in descriptions of Russian will be interesting. A second question is linked to the attitude which educated Russians will take toward the normative works. The latest editions of Ožegov and Avanesov have been published in very large printings.[57] These basic normative works will, consequently be available to a large part of the Soviet population. We must wait to see what effect these works will have within the controlled Soviet system on the actual speech habits of Russians.

Notes

1. Earlier versions of this paper were read at the 1960 M. L. A. meeting before the Slavic Linguistics Group and at the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies of Fordham University in March 1961.

2. See, for example, Lawrence L. Thomas, The Linguistic Theories of N. Ja. Marr (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957), and George P. Springer, "Soviet Linguistic Theory," unpubl. diss. (Harvard, 1954), pp. 100-116 and 257-331.

3. For example Jindrich Kučera, "Language Policy in Soviet Union," unpubl. diss. (Harvard, 1952); Jacob Ornstein, "Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice," The Slavic and East European Journal, III (XVII) (1959), 1-24; Uriel Weinreich, "The Russification of Soviet Minority Languages," Problems of Communism, II, No. 6 (1953), pp. 46-57.

4. See J. Vendreyes, Language (New York, 1925), p. 261.

5. S. I. Ožegov, "Osnovnye čerty razvitija russkogo jazyka v Sovetskuju èpoxu," Akademija Nauk S.S.S.R., Izvestija Otdel. lit. i jazyka, X, No. 1 (1951), p. 29, and I. K. Beloded and A. S. Mel'ničuk, "Voprosy razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov v period perexoda ot socializma k kommunizmu," Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1959, No. 5, p. 5.

6. The effect of the Revolution on Russian has been described in various works. See, for example, Lev Uspenskij, "Russkij jazyk posle revoljucii," Slavia, X (1931), 252-287; A. Mazon, Lexique de la guerre et de la révolution en Russie (Paris, 1920); A. Seliščev, Jazyk revoljucionnoj èpoxi (Moskva, 1928); Roman Jakobson, "Slavische Sprachfragen in der Sovjetunion," Slavische Rundschau, VI (1936), 325-326.

7. Kučera, pp. 194-198.

8. G. Vinokur, La Langue russe, tr. Y. Millet (Paris, 1947), pp. 139-140.

9. See A. I. Efimov, Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Moskva, 1954), pp. 408-414; Kučera, pp. 208-210; Jakobson, pp. 327-332.

10. See, for example, Julian Towster, Political Power in the U.S.S.R. (New York, 1948), pp. 99-102.

11. See Herbert Rubenstein, "The Recent Conflict in Soviet Linguistics," Language, XXVII, (1951), 281-287.

12. I. Stalin, "Otnositel'no marksizma v jazykoznanii," Novoe vremja (Priloženie), June 28, 1950, pp. 4-6.

13. See, for example, V. V. Vinogradov, Velikij russkij jazyk (Moskva, 1945), pp. 157-158, and V. B. Brodskaja and S. O. Calenčuk, Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (L'vov, 1957), p. 9.

14. Vop. jaz., 1958, No. 4, p. 146.

15. Ibid.

16. S. I. Ožegov, "Sektor kul'tury reči instituta jazykoznanija A.N.S.S.S.R. i ego zadači," Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 1, p. 152.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p. 153.

19. See Vinogradov's review of A. Gvozdev, Očerki po stilistike russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1952) in Vop. jaz., 1952, No. 6, p. 136, where he criticizes Gvozdev's definition. See also Vinogradov's article "Itogi obsuždenija voprosov stilistiki," Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 1, p. 66.

20. A. Gvozdev, Očerki po stilistike russkogo jazyka (2nd ed., Moskva, 1955), p. 8.

21. Ibid., p. 10.

22. S. I. Ožegov, "O trëx tipax tolkovyx slovarej russkogo jazyka," Vop. jaz., 1952, No. 2, p. 94. This statement is

repeated almost exactly in Ožegov's "Očerednye voprosy kul'tury reči," Voprosy kul'tury reči (Moskva, 1955), p. 15.

23. "O perspectivnom plane našix jazykovedčeskix issledovanij na bližajšie gody," Vop. jaz., 1960, No. 2, p. 9.

24. See the Academy Grammatika russkogo jazyka (2nd. ed., Moskva, 1960), I, 47-48; Uspenskij, pp. 263 and 270; Ožegov, "Očerednye . . .," p. 17.

25. For a discussion of various speech levels see the Academy Grammatika, I, 54-56, and Leonard Bloomfield, Language (New York, 1933), p. 52.

26. Ožegov, "O trëx . . .," p. 90.

27. See, for example, Gvozdev, op. cit., pp. 11-15; the review of Instrukcii dlja sostavlenija Slovarja sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka by T. G. Brjanceva and R. M. Cejtlin in Vop. jaz., 1954, No. 3, p. 118; Ju. S. Sorokin, "K voprosu ob osnovnyx ponjatijax stilistiki," Vop. jaz., 1954, No. 2, p. 68.

28. An example is Welsh. See Melville Richards, "Standard and Dialect in Welsh," Archivum Linguisticum, II (1950), 46-55.

29. The following reviews of the first edition indicate some of these faults: È. I. Korotaeva in Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 1, pp. 109-120; M. M. Nikitina and V. P. Suxotin in Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 3, pp. 110-121; W. K. Matthews in the Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII, No. 78 (1953), pp. 251-256, and XXXIV, No. 82 (1955), pp. 245-250.

30. Slovar' russkogo jazyka (4th ed., Moskva, 1960), p. 14.

31. The Academy Slovar' russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1957) I, 860, and Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Moskva, 1956), V, 6, respectively. This inconsistency was pointed out to this writer by Professor Thomas Magner.

32. See, for example, A. I. Efimov, "Nekotorye voprosy razvitija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XIX — načala XX vv.," Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 4, pp. 26-27.

33. The reviews of the Academy Grammatika, listed in footnote 29, indicate the difficulties of treating grammatical innovations normatively.

34. See Ožegov, "Osnovnye . . .," p. 36 and "O trëx . . .," p. 95.

35. E. S. Istrina, "A. A. Šaxmatov kak redaktor slovarja russkogo jazyka," Akademija Nauk S. S. S. R., Izvestija Otdel. lit. i jazyka, V, No. 5 (1946), 415, and Ožegov, "Očerednye . . .," pp. 9-10.

36. L. V. Ščerba, Izbrannye raboty po jazykoznaniju i fonetike (Leningrad, 1958), p. 16.

37. Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie, p. 3.

38. Ibid.

39. Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie i udarenie (2nd ed., Moskva, 1959), p. 4. The same statement had been made in the first edition (1955).

It should be noted that Soviet normative works have failed to indicate the criteria by which variants are selected. In the Foreword of both editions of the work just cited, for example, the following statement is made: "Individual disagreements between the normative recommendations of the Academy Grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1952) and the Slovar' russkogo jazyka by S. I. Ožegov (Moskva, 1952) on the one hand, and this dictionary on the other, are attributable to the more precise establishment of the norms [in the latter] on the basis of new data obtained through research" (p. 5 of 1959 edition). No data concerning this research are given.

40. "O trëx . . .," p. 90.

41. "K voprosu o 'pravil'nosti' reči," Vop. jaz., 1960, No. 2, pp. 35-42.

42. Ibid., p. 35. On the general problem of phonetic and morphological variants in Russian, see O. S. Axmanova, Očerki po obščej i russkoj leksikologii (Moskva, 1957), pp. 192-233 and the same author's "O fonetičeskix i morfologičeskix variantax slova," Akademiku Viktoru Vladimiroviču Vinogradovu (Moskva, 1956), pp. 42-59.

43. Axmanova, "K voprosu . . .," p. 35. The editors of Voprosy jazykoznanija have since printed a letter disputing the need for establishing orthology. See Ju. M. Skrebnev, "K voprosu ob 'ortologii,'" Vop. jaz., 1961, No. 1, pp. 140-142.

44. The dictionaries are now prepared by the Dictionary Section of the Russian Language Institute. The Grammatika was prepared under the editorship of V. Vinogradov, Director of the Russian Language Institute.

45. Review of Vols. I and II by R. R. Gel'gardt in Russkij jazyk v škole, 1959, No. 6, p. 100.

46. Review of Vol. I by È. I. Korotaeva in Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 1, p. 116.

47. Concerning the Grammatika see also E. A. Ivančikova, "Obsuždenie I toma 'Grammatika russkogo jazyka,'" Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 2, pp. 142-143, and V. F. Ivanova, "Obsuždenie vtorogo toma 'Grammatika russkogo jazyka'," Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 4, p. 149. For comments on the 1952 edition of Ožegov's Slovar' see the review by R. R. Gel'gardt in Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 3, pp. 134-138, and A. P. Evgen'eva, "K voprosu o tipe odnotomnogo tolkovogo slovarja russkogo jazyka sovetskoj èpoxi," Vop. jaz., 1953, No. 3, p. 50. For criticism of the fifteen-volume Slovar' see the review of Vols. V and VI by E. A. Zemskaja and I. I. Kovtunova in Vop. jaz., 1958, No. 2, p. 136. Failure consistently to select the standard pronunciation from among variants in the 1955 edition of Avanesov's work on stress has been noted in a review by L. Kopeckij, Vop. jaz., 1957, No. 2, p. 120.

48. On the first page of the Foreword to the 1960 edition, Ožegov states that he has tried "to strengthen the normative

side of the Dictionary . . . Thus, stress variants are given only in rare instances and only with an indication of the recommended variant."

49. See Russkij jazyk v škole, 1960, No. 5, pp. 115-119.

50. Ronald Hingley, "'Fluid Areas' in Russian Declension," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXVII, No. 88 (1958), pp. 84-86.

51. The seven nouns still not described identically are the following: vorox 'heap,' pekar' 'baker,' jastreb 'hawk,' voz 'cart,' krejser 'cruiser,' pudel' 'poodle,' traktor 'tractor.' For traktor Ožegov gives traktorá as the preferred plural with tráktory as acceptable. Avanesov's description is the opposite, with tráktory being preferred. For the other six nouns, Ožegov is more strictly normative. He gives only voroxá, pekarjá, jastrebá, vozý, krejserá, and pudeljá. Avanesov gives voroxá, pekarjá, jastrebá, vozý, kréjsery, púdeli as preferred to the acceptable variants vóroxi, pékari, jástreby, vozá, krejserá, pudeljá. Ožegov's greater selectivity is to be expected since in the Foreword to the 1960 edition of his Slovar' he states that at times he has been more strictly normative than Avanesov's Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie i udarenie.

52. Kulinarija (Moskva, 1959), p. 49 and facing picture.

53. The fluctuation between y and á may be stylistically motivated. See the Academy Grammatika, I, 147-148, and Hingley, pp. 89-91.

54. Ožegov, "Očerednye . . .," p. 13.

55. See, for example, S. I. Kotkov, Usvoenie norm literaturnogo jazyka v uslovijax južnovelikorusskogo dialekta (Moskva, 1957). The journal Russkij jazyk v škole is an aid to teachers of Russian in areas of the Soviet Union where the native language is Russian. The journal Russkij jazyk v nacional'noj škole serves teachers of Russian in other areas.

56. The journal Russkij jazyk v škole has a regular question-and-answer section which reflects the teachers' desire for normative information on Russian.

57. The printing of the 1960 Ožegov was 450,000 copies. The 1959 and 1960 printings of Avanesov were 200,000 each.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Slavic & East European Journal TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."